

Application No. 10/656,698

Second Reply to Office Action of September 22, 2005 and Advisory Action of February 3, 2006

REMARKS

Claims 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39 and 41 are presently pending in the application.

Applicants acknowledge and appreciate the time and courtesy afforded to Applicants' undersigned representative Sandra Katz during a brief telephone interview on February 7, 2006. During this interview, the undersigned questioned why the amendments above, previously presented in the Amendment After Final filed December 20, 2005, introduced new matter, as indicated in the Advisory Action of February 3, 2006. Specifically, the Examiner argues that the "surface tension" limitation of claim 1 had not been incorporated into the amended claims.

However, the undersigned explained that the Examiner stated in the first Office Action (May 17, 2005) that claims 7, 11, 19, etc. were only objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In the first Office Action, the Examiner states that the "Sn or Ag film" recited in claim 7, the "conductors have a disk-like shape" recited in claim 11, and the "metal particles are made of a material..." recited in claim 19, in combination with all the limitations of the respective claims, rendered the claims patentable over the prior art of record. It is noted that the original base claim, claim 1, did not contain the "surface tension" limitation; it was added after the first Office Action and was not necessary for allowability of claims 7, 11, 19, etc according to the Examiner.

The Examiner takes the position in the Advisory Action that in the final Office Action, the dependent claims were stated to be allowable if rewritten to include "all" of the limitations of the base claims, which would indicate that the "surface tension" limitation must also be incorporated. The Examiner stated in the telephone interview that he understands Applicants' position, and requested that a further response be filed which explains this position.

Applicants respectfully submit that because the Examiner clearly stated in the first Office Action (prior to the amendment to claim 1 to add the "surface tension" limitation)

Application No. 10/656,698

Second Reply to Office Action of September 22, 2005 and Advisory Action of February 3, 2006

that claims 7, 11, 19, etc. were allowable for the reasons set forth above, the present amendments indeed place the claims in condition for allowance and do not raise new issues. Accordingly, entry of the present Amendment and a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 23, 25, and the even-numbered claims between 2 and 42 have been canceled. Claims 7, 11 and 19 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter from canceled claims 1 and 3, and claims 9, 13, and 21 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter from canceled claim 5. The remaining claims have been amended to change "An" to "The". No new matter has been added by these amendments. Further, since these amendments are merely formal in nature and will place the application in condition for allowance, as explained below, entry after final is deemed appropriate and respectfully requested.

Applicants acknowledge and appreciate the Examiner's indication in the present Office Action that claims 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, and 41 are only objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims. By this amendment, claims 7, 9, 11, 13, 19 and 21 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter from the base claims, and the remaining claims 15, 17, 27, 29, 35, 37, 39 and 41 depend on these claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are allowable, and the summary of the outstanding rejections which follows is only being provided to complete the record.

Specifically, in the present Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2002-25405 ("JP '405") and has rejected claims 23 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP '405 in view of U.S. Patent No. 1,214,879 of Baruch ("Baruch"). The Examiner has also rejected claims 1, 3, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 59-8231 ("JP '231") in view of EP 2000-141079 ("EP '079"), and has rejected claims 23 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP '231 in view of EP '079 and further in view of Baruch. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as follows.

Application No. 10/656,698

Second Reply to Office Action of September 22, 2005 and Advisory Action of February 3, 2006

By the present amendment, all of the rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 23, and 25 have been canceled, rendering all of the § 103(a) rejections moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejections are respectfully requested.

In view of the preceding Amendments and Remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claim are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Yoshiaki TANAKA

February 7, 2006
(Date)

By:

SANDRA M. KATZ

Registration No. 51,864

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUSER & FELD LLP

One Commerce Square

2005 Market Street, Suite 2200

Philadelphia, PA 19103-7013

Telephone: 215-965-1200

Direct Dial: 215-965-1344

Facsimile: 215-965-1210

E-Mail: skatz@akingump.com

SMK:rc